

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Future TI Updates - Tasking - urgent!
Date: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 5:07:54 PM
Attachments: [OA FME TI Monthly White Paper 02-26-2010 \(2\).doc](#)
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

The attached white sheet replaces the monthly C-1 Brief. When preparing them we now must vet it through OCC, OBP and OPA S&L (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is the only one that came back with comments and we have been told to incorporate his comments/address his comments. Since you are the most familiar with O-1 through O-3 you are the one being tasked. Below is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) comment:

My only comment is on the O-1 through O-3 section:

I understand that AC2 has been briefed on the issue and has already given direction on options; but, I do not see any discussion of the ongoing analysis within CBP; also, it looks like we have had this letter for over a month so I am guessing he will ask why it has taken so long...just my thoughts...

If you can get to this tonight and get it turned back around in the morning we would very much appreciate it.

Thanks!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Real Estate Analyst
Strategic Analysis, Inc.
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

~~Warning: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need to know" without prior approval from the originator. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the originator for disposition instructions.~~

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Future TI Updates - Tasking - urgent!
Date: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 8:01:49 PM
Attachments: [OA FME TI Monthly White Paper 02-26-2010 \(2\).doc](#)
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7)

What additional "ongoing analysis within CBP" are you referring to?

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2010 5:08 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Future TI Updates - Tasking - urgent!
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7)

The attached white sheet replaces the monthly C-1 Brief. When preparing them we now must vet it through OCC, OBP and OPA S&L (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is the only one that came back with comments and we have been told to incorporate his comments/address his comments. Since you are the most familiar with O-1 through O-3 you are the one being tasked. Below is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) comment:

My only comment is on the O-1 through O-3 section:

I understand that AC2 has been briefed on the issue and has already given direction on options; but, I do not see any discussion of the ongoing analysis within CBP; also, it looks like we have had this letter for over a month so I am guessing he will ask why it has taken so long...just my thoughts...

If you can get to this tonight and get it turned back around in the morning we would very much appreciate it.

Thanks!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Real Estate Analyst
Strategic Analysis, Inc.
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

~~Warning: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need to know" without prior approval from the originator. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the originator for disposition instructions.~~

OBP PMO Tactical Infrastructure White Paper
February 26, 2010

Fence Status:

- As of February 19, 2010:
 - (b) (7)(E) of Vehicle Fence (VF) have been completed.
 - (b) (7)(E) of Pedestrian Fence (PF) have been completed.
 - There are (b) (7)(E) of PF left to construct.

Fence Segments O-1 through O-3 Starr County, Texas:

- Despite former Commissioner Ruth's acknowledgement during a January 6, 2010 meeting with CBP, that from a practical perspective the fencing will have no impact on the floodplain (zero impact to Mexico and negligible to U.S.), new Commissioner Drusina sent the Acting Commissioner a letter on January 21, 2010 indicating that the U.S. International Boundary Water Commission (USIBWC) could not support the construction of the fence due to "substantial increases in water surface elevations and deflection in water flows at several locations."
- Facilities Management & Engineering (FM&E) has drafted a suggested response letter for the Acting Commissioner to send to USIBWC Commissioner Drusina and the Department of State that refutes their conclusion.

Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR):

- FM&E, working in coordination with Procurement, is staggering the release of the four Requests for Proposal for CTIMR.
- Dates of note:
 - All four CTIMR RFPs have been issued, as of February 2010.
 - FM&E received proposals for the first two RFPs on February 12, 2010. The other two RFP proposals are due in March and April, 2010.
 - CBP is still on track to award all contracts by the third and fourth quarters of fiscal year 2010.

Real Estate Status:

- (b) (5)
- (b) (5)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: C1 White Paper Updates
Date: Monday, June 21, 2010 4:52:51 AM

Thanks (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) ...this is a big help as usual!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) I'll provide you something on the (b) (7)(E) C1 project and any other relevant items worth noting in the brief by the 0830.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
TI Branch Chief, Planning & Project Mgmt
Customs and Border Protection
FM&E OBP PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, June 20, 2010 11:18 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: C1 White Paper Updates

Hi (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Please see my suggested edits and comments below. Please call me on my cell phone if you have any questions.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 12:53 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: C1 White Paper Updates

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

It's that time again. We have to provide the monthly C1 White Paper to the front office. Please update the information below. Strike what is no longer relevant and/or add projects that we have not included previously but that you believe would be of interest to C1. I'll let you two work out who updates what, I just need to updates back NLT COB Friday, June 18th.

Best,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Fence Segments O-1 through O-3 Starr County, Texas:

- A meeting between CBP, the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) and the Department of State (DoS) was held on May 13, 2010 to discuss the possibility of a unilateral decision to allow us to build.

- A summary of the meeting outcomes are as follows:
 - Segment O-1 - USIBWC proposed (b) (5)
[REDACTED]
 - Segment O-2 – USIBWC (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)] also proposed (b) (5)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)] Delete remaining sentences
 - Segment O-3 – Commissioner Drusina concurred with CBP's modeling and stated that he would (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)] seek CILA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)] 's "concurrence" to construct the segment.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) El Paso, Texas:

- USIBWC notified FM&E on March 22, 2010 that the (b) (7)(E) pedestrian fence segment (approximately (b) (7)(E) completed on the north side of IBWC's levee and in proximity to the (b) (7)(E) Border Patrol Station conflicts with flood protection improvements IBWC plans to construct to their levee. Since that time, CBP and IBWC have worked closely at the staff level to find a resolution. Consequently, IBWC is revising their flood protection improvement design to install a new flood wall on the south side of the levee. It should not impact CBP's tactical infrastructure but IBWC have agreed to provide us a courtesy set of plans once available so CBP can confirm no impacts.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) Del Rio, Texas:

- (b) (7)(E) USACE PM reported that USIBWC is voicing concerns that (b) (7)(E) and (b) (7)(E) fence alignment were not approved by IBWC. FM&E BPFTI PMO's Chief Engineer attended meeting with IBWC where IBWC personnel verbally confirmed former Commissioner Marin's intent to sign a unilateral decision letter approving these fence segments. This topic was also discussed at the May 13, 2010 meeting with USIBWC at which time USIBWC and CBP agreed to continue collaborating to find a solution. (b) (6);(b) (7)(C) -IBWC was only concerned about the (b) (7)(E) of proposed (b) (7)(E) to be built w/in the floodplain. Similar to segment O-3, they agreed that the impacts to the floodplain will be minimal with our current proposed fence alignment and Commissioner Drusina agreed at the May 13, 2010 meeting to seek CILA's "concurrence" to construct the segment.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) Rio Grande Valley, Texas:

- (b) (7)(E) Fence completed (b) (7)(E)
pending engineering study/report of structural integrity of IBWC-owned levee wall. (b) (6);(b) (7)(C) the study was completed and the existing retaining walls (there are two) were found to not be structural capability of support the proposed floating fence so the Corps is in the process of designing an in-ground foundation system. This work will now be completed as component of (b) (7)(E)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Communications and Reporting Branch Chief
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: C1 White Paper Updates
Date: Sunday, June 20, 2010 10:20:11 PM
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

My laptop was re-imaged Friday. I tried it yesterday and again tonight and it's still not working properly...I have to reconfigure the MS Outlook (which I can't do without OIT support). It's been a crazy weekend and I wasn't planning to be on the helpdesk line for over an hour tonight to get nowhere with them!!

Anyway, I'll be heading to the office early tomorrow and will review the C1 report and my PMs' weekly status reports on the way in so I can provide you an update for the C1 brief.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) please add/update anything you can before your flight tomorrow from your perspective...any help would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

TI Branch Chief, Planning & Project Mgmt
Customs and Border Protection
FM&E OBP PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 12:53 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: C1 White Paper Updates

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) _

It's that time again. We have to provide the monthly C1 White Paper to the front office. Please update the information below. Strike what is no longer relevant and/or add projects that we have not included previously but that you believe would be of interest to C1. I'll let you two work out who updates what, I just need to updates back NLT COB Friday, June 18th.

Best,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Fence Segments O-1 through O-3 Starr County, Texas:

- A meeting between CBP, the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) and the Department of State (DoS) was held on May 13, 2010 to discuss the possibility of a unilateral decision to allow us to build.
- A summary of the meeting outcomes are as follows:
 - Segment O-1 - USIBWC proposed that (b) (5)

(b) (5)

- Segment O-2 – USIBWC had the same issues on this segment as O-1. However, in this case realignment would put a good portion of the community south of the fence including a school and dozens of homes. Facilities Management and Engineering (FM&E) Executive Director (b) (5) took part in this discussion and informed USIBWC that this was not a viable option. USACE modeling shows the sheet flow impact at less than an inch. No concurrence or non-concurrence was given on the segment.
- Segment O-3 – Commissioner Drusina concurred with CBP's modeling and stated that he would be willing to take it to CILA for discussion.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) El Paso, Texas:

- USIBWC notified FM&E on March 22, 2010 that the (b) (7)(E) pedestrian fence segment (approximately (b) (7)(E) completed on the north side of IBWC's levee and in proximity to the (b) (7)(E) Border Patrol Station conflicts with flood protection improvements IBWC plans to construct to their levee. Since that time, CBP and IBWC have worked closely at the staff level to find a resolution. Consequently, IBWC is revising their flood protection improvement design to install a new flood wall on the south side of the levee. It should not impact CBP's tactical infrastructure but IBWC have agreed to provide us a courtesy set of plans once available so CBP can confirm no impacts.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) Del Rio, Texas:

- (b) (7)(E) USACE PM reported that USIBWC is voicing concerns that (b) (7)(E) (b) (7)(E) fence alignment were not approved by IBWC. FM&E BPFTI PMO's Chief Engineer attended meeting with IBWC where IBWC personnel verbally confirmed former Commissioner Marin's intent to sign a unilateral decision letter approving these fence segments. This topic was also discussed at the May 13, 2010 meeting with USIBWC at which time USIBWC and CBP agreed to continue collaborating to find a solution.

Fence Segment (b) (7)(E) Rio Grande Valley, Texas:

- (b) (7)(E) Fence completed (b) (7)(E) (b) (7)(E) pending engineering study/report of structural integrity of IBWC-owned levee wall. This work will now be completed as component of (b) (7)(E)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Communications and Reporting Branch Chief
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: outcome of IBWC mtg
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 9:05:29 AM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thru O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)

Hi (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Overall the meeting went well. It was focused on our proposed pedestrian fence segments O-1 thru O-3 we want to build in RGV. Portions of the fencing needs to be installed in the flood plain of the Rio Grand river. We have conducted numerous studies and analyses over the last 3 yrs that we believe demonstrates the fencing will not adversely effect the flood plain. IBWC's technical experts don't concur w/ us the technical results of the study, however, we believe from a practical perspective, they agree with our conclusions. They have asked us for some additional information, which we are assembling, before they discuss with Mexico.

I've attached our briefing for situational awareness. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) represented BP in the meeting.

Take care,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, July 21, 2010 8:53 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: outcome of IBWC mtg

Hi, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – Just left you a message re any outcomes from IBWC meetings yesterday. As I mentioned, several of us from Border Patrol will be meeting with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) tomorrow to provide a basic BP 101 as well as talk about PLLA program, BMTFs, and other vehicles to build interagency collaboration. Please send a quick note or give me a call if you have a chance.

Thanks a lot,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Senior Program Analyst
U.S. Border Patrol, Strategic Planning Branch,
Communications Coordinator, PLLA Environmental Stewardship Program
Department of Homeland Security
1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Washington, DC 20229
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Segment O-3
Date: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 3:58:40 PM
Attachments: [DSCF2337.JPG](#)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Attached is an aerial view of the flooding on the west side of the Los Ebanos POE/Ferry in Segment O-3.

As you can see in the photograph, the water line is past projected fence alignment and the POE is in about two feet of water.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Supervisory Border Patrol Agent
SBI-net TI Team
Rio Grande Valley Sector Headquarters

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Segment O-3
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2010 6:45:13 PM

Do you have any other photos in the vicinity of the O-1, O-2 or O-3? I'd like to see everything you've got. It might help us w/ our discussions w/ IBWC.

Thanks

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2010 3:57 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Segment O-3

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Attached is an aerial view of the flooding on the west side of the Los Ebanos POE/Ferry in Segment O-3.

As you can see in the photograph, the water line is past projected fence alignment and the POE is in about two feet of water.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Supervisory Border Patrol Agent
SBI-net TI Team
Rio Grande Valley Sector Headquarters
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting
Date: Monday, July 19, 2010 6:53:34 PM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thr O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)

Attached the revised Powerpoint presentation for your review.
Please let me know if you need me to make any additional changes.

(b) (6), P.E.
Project Manager I

Baker

Michael Baker Jr Inc.
2929 N Central Ave
Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85012

(b) (6)
(b) (6)
(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 7:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

[FYSA](#)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 5:16 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

Thanks (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [I made a couple of additional tweaks. Please use this version...](#)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 1:57 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: Re: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

[We'll take a look](#)

[Message sent via my BlackBerry Wireless Device](#)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Sent: Sun Jul 18 12:44:27 2010
Subject: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Can you and Baker help me "fill-in" the missing the data as well as verify the existing info in the attached draft briefing? Would like back ASAP but definitely need by COB. Please let me know soonest if this isn't doable.

I'm meeting with (b) (6), (b) (7) first thing to discuss the briefing and general strategy for the meeting and may set up a conference call later in the day to discuss with you all and OBP. Please stay tuned for that possible meeting invite.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), P.E., PMP, LEED-AP, CCM
Chief Engineer
CBP, OA, FM&E
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 white paper
Date: Monday, August 02, 2010 6:02:29 PM
Attachments: (b) (5)

Nice job. My suggested revisions are reflected in the attached document.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 12:08 PM
To: (b) (6); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 white paper

Sorry..here is the attachment

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 9:05 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 white paper

All, here is the latest narrative we have for discussion on the call today. We will be using the exhibits we uploaded to the FTP last Thursday. The plan is to get everyone's comments today, make the changes by COB today and upload the final for all to download for the meeting with IBWC on Wednesday.

Thanks

(b) (6)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, August 01, 2010 4:44 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); (b) (6)
Subject: O-1 thru O-3 white paper
When: Monday, August 02, 2010 11:30 AM-12:00 PM (GMT-07:00) Arizona.
Where: (b) (7)(E) pass code (b) (7)(E)

Tentative meeting to discuss comments on O-1 thru O-3 white paper

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting
Date: Monday, July 19, 2010 10:16:28 AM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thr O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)

FYSA

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 5:16 PM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

Thanks (b) (6) I made a couple of additional tweaks. Please use this version...

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 1:57 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: Re: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

We'll take a look

Message sent via my BlackBerry Wireless Device

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Sent: Sun Jul 18 12:44:27 2010
Subject: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

(b) (6)

Can you and Baker help me "fill-in" the missing the data as well as verify the existing info in the attached draft briefing? Would like back ASAP but definitely need by COB. Please let me know soonest if this isn't doable.

I'm meeting with (b) (6), (b) (7) first thing to discuss the briefing and general strategy for the meeting and may set up a conference call later in the day to discuss with you all and OBP. Please stay tuned for that possible meeting invite.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), P.E., PMP, LEED-AP, CCM
Chief Engineer
CBP, OA, FM&E
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting
Date: Sunday, July 18, 2010 1:44:44 PM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thr O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)
Importance: High

(b) (6)

Can you and Baker help me "fill-in" the missing the data as well as verify the existing info in the attached draft briefing? Would like back ASAP but definitely need by COB. Please let me know soonest if this isn't doable.

I'm meeting with (b) (6), (b) (7) first thing to discuss the briefing and general strategy for the meeting and may set up a conference call later in the day to discuss with you all and OBP. Please stay tuned for that possible meeting invite.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), P.E., PMP, LEED-AP, CCM
Chief Engineer
CBP, OA, FM&E
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Fw: Draft TI OBP sr. leadership briefing
Date: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 9:54:10 AM
Attachments: 09_03_10_Chief (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) issues brief_V1.ppt

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Tactical Infrastructure PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from my Blackberry w/o the benefit of spell check

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wed Sep 01 18:08:19 2010
Subject: RE: Draft TI OBP sr. leadership briefing

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

The updated briefing is attached.

I assume G2 told about IBWC's decision regarding O-1 thru O-3. Not sure how you want to address in briefing.

Thx

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wed 9/1/2010 3:17 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Draft TI OBP sr. leadership briefing

If you can send me the PP I can make my edits –if not here are my edits

(b) (7)(E) add a bullet – Require S-1 approval to initiate the ESP for the Project –

Delete the Yuma (b) (7)(E) bullet

Thanks

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2010 10:40 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Draft TI OBP sr. leadership briefing

Folks

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and others are meeting with OBP leadership including Chief (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on Friday to brief them on the status of our TI projects. Given the time constraints not all projects are discussed at this briefing as we try to focus it on projects we understand the Chief to be most interested in. Please review the attached briefing for factual accuracy and send me your suggested comments by COB tomorrow.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), P.E., PMP, LEED-AP, CCM

Chief Engineer

CBP, OA, FM&E

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CBP Office of Finance Facilities Management and Engineering

Tactical Infrastructure Update

September 3, 2010



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

O-1 thru O-3

- Awaiting IBWC/Dept of State decision on our current proposed alignments
- We believe we have successfully demonstrated that the fence will not impact the flood plain in MX and not adversely impact any existing structures in the U.S.



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

NON-RESPONSIVE



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FLOOD PICS
Date: Monday, July 19, 2010 7:30:19 AM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thr O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Attached is a **preliminary draft** of the briefing I prepared for tomorrow. I have the maps that are referred to in the briefing. I'm planning to meet with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and 11 to review. The Corps is filling in the "?" for us. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thx

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 7:22 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FLOOD PICS

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Is it possible to get some maps, and current status, of the "newly" proposed alignments from the May meeting with IBWC in El Paso? I want to make sure our immediate chain of command is briefed for tomorrow morning's meeting.

tk

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2010 4:04 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FLOOD PICS

Thanks

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2010 3:59 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: FLOOD PICS
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Here are some pictures of the west end of Segment O-1, can you imagine what would have happened if we would have stayed on the bottom (near the river) with our original alignment.

Picture O37 is property RGC-1000 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Picture 038 is property RGC-1001 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) property) and RGC-1002 (USFWS property)

Picture 039 is RGC-1002 (USFWS property – Oyster bed)

We will send you more photos as they are provided of the O-1 thru O-3 segments.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RGV SBInet Team

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, July 16, 2010 2:29 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: FLOOD PICS

Some pics of the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) area west end of Project O1

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RGV SBITI/PLLA

Office (956)-984-3823

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 6:07 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: FLOOD PICS

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 2:31 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FLOOD PICS

Hey (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) whats up??? Were you able to find any recent pics of flooding

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

RGV SBITI/PLLA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: Fw: O-1 thru O-3 white paper
Date: Monday, August 02, 2010 12:11:14 PM
Attachments: (b) (5)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Cell: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from my Blackberry w/o the benefit of spell check

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Mon Aug 02 12:07:55 2010
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 white paper

Sorry..here is the attachment

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 9:05 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 white paper

All, here is the latest narrative we have for discussion on the call today. We will be using the exhibits we uploaded to the FTP last Thursday. The plan is to get everyone's comments today, make the changes by COB today and upload the final for all to download for the meeting with IBWC on Wednesday.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

-----Original Appointment-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Sunday, August 01, 2010 4:44 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: O-1 thru O-3 white paper
When: Monday, August 02, 2010 11:30 AM-12:00 PM (GMT-07:00) Arizona.
Where: (b) (7)(E) pass code (b) (7)(E)

Tentative meeting to discuss comments on O-1 thru O-3 white paper

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting
Date: Sunday, July 18, 2010 5:16:12 PM
Attachments: [07_20_10_O-1 thr O-3 State Dept brief.ppt](#)

Thanks (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) I made a couple of additional tweaks. Please use this version...

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Sunday, July 18, 2010 1:57 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: Re: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

We'll take a look

Message sent via my BlackBerry Wireless Device

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Sent: Sun Jul 18 12:44:27 2010
Subject: O-1 thru O-3 Brief for July 20th meeting

(b) (6)

Can you and Baker help me "fill-in" the missing the data as well as verify the existing info in the attached draft briefing? Would like back ASAP but definitely need by COB. Please let me know soonest if this isn't doable.

I'm meeting with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) first thing to discuss the briefing and general strategy for the meeting and may set up a conference call later in the day to discuss with you all and OBP. Please stay tuned for that possible meeting invite.

Thanks

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), P.E., PMP, LEED-AP, CCM
Chief Engineer
CBP, OA, FM&E
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CBP Office of Finance Facilities Management and Engineering

Briefing to Department of State Pedestrian Fence Segments O-1, O-2 and O-3

July 20, 2010



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



Why Are These Fence Segments Needed?

BLUF: The construction of O-1, O-2 and O-3 is critical to our Nation's security as well as the safety of the nearby local communities and we need IBWC and Department of State's support for an unilateral decision to proceed with the fence construction

Areas in which O-1, O-2 and O-3 are proposed are currently and have historically been subjected to significant illegal border activities

- In FY 09:
 - 1,400 apprehensions
 - 25,000 lbs of marijuana seized
 - Border Patrol agents victims of 8 violent acts

The construction of O-1, O-2 and O-3 is CBP's highest tactical infrastructure priority

- Included in April 2008 Secretary Waiver
- Construction is funded



Background

- All 3 segments to be built in areas with no flood protection levees with wide flood plain limits
- O-1, O-2 and O-3 are (b) (7)(E) miles in length, respectively.
- “Bollard style” fence
- Began planning & design of the segments in Fall 2007 thru present
- Technical analysis has proven to be very challenging (and expensive)
 - Hydraulic modeling is not an exact science
 - Treaty thresholds are conservative
 - Multiple analyses conducted over the last 2 yrs
 - +\$1M in “design analysis” costs
- Mexico has consistently opposed the construction of border fencing since the passage of the Secure Fence Act



Study Summary

- Assumed flood event (240,000 cfs) is based on a 1988 Hurricane Gilbert in Rio Grande City
- IBWC criteria:
 - Max. flow deflection = 5%
 - Max rise in water surface elevation (WSE) = 3" in Urban areas and 6" in Rural Areas.
- Fence is modeled as (b) (7)(E) solid wall
 - Conservative assumption
 - (b) (7)(E)
- Current CBP proposed alignments result in:
 - No impacts above thresholds in Mexico!
 - Impacts in U.S. are minimal (see segment summary slides & maps)
- IBWC recommended alignments
 - (b) (5)
 - (b) (5)



O-1 Segment Summary

- Located in Roma, Texas
- Approximately (b) (7)(E) with approximately (b) (7)(E) located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier with an (b) (7)(E)
(b) (7)(E)
- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC's criteria
- 91% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC's criteria
 - 9 X-sections (out of 95) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) increases greater than 6-inches
 - Of the 9 X-sections, 6 exceed threshold by less than 2.5 inches; maximum increase is 11.4 inches
 - All 9 X-sections located in agricultural areas; no impacts on existing structures; maximum increase in flood plain width is 35 feet
 - All 95 X-sections meet Flow Diversion threshold



O-2 Segment Summary

- Located in Rio Grande City, Texas
- Approximately (b) (7)(E) with approximately (b) (7)(E) located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier with (b) (7)(E)
- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC's criteria
- 84% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC's criteria
 - 3 X-sections (out of 83) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) increases greater than 6-inches
 - Of the 3 X-sections, 2 exceed threshold by less than 1.5 inches; maximum increase is 9.8-inches
 - The 3 X-sections are located in an approximately 1000 ft section of agricultural areas; no impacts on existing structures
 - 69 X-sections (out of 83) meet Flow Diversion threshold
 - All 14 X-sections located immediately downstream of the 275 ft gap
 - Of the 14 X-sections that exceed the threshold, 11 exceed by less than 2%; maximum flow diversion is 10.62% at X-section 9385.623
 - At all 14 X-sections, the projected river velocities are reduced relative to the existing conditions and all very low (less than 1 ft/sec)



O-3 Segment Summary

- Located in Los Ebanos, Texas
- Approximately (b) (7)(E) long all of it located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier
- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC's criteria
- 89% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC's criteria
 - All X-sections (out of 35) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) within the threshold
 - 4 X-section (out of 35) exceeded the Flow Diversion threshold
 - Because of the alignment of the river channel (serpentine) and the orientation of the cross-sections in this area, the model's estimate flow diversion results are not indicative of actual expected conditions
 - Projected velocities are essentially the same for pre-fence vs. post fence conditions and are very low (less than 1 ft/sec)



Conclusion

- From a practical perspective, our proposed fence alignments will not adversely effect the floodplain in Mexico or U.S.
- Our current proposed alignments reflect the optimum locations from the perspective of border security and flood plain impacts
- We need IBWC and State Department support to build these segments as soon as possible



(b) (5)

(b) (5)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 2:23 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: URGENT - O-1 through O-3 messaging

All:

Attached -- per our conversation this morning -- is an initial draft of the talking points surrounding the O-1 through O-3 projects. This would set the basis for a more developed media strategy.

Please review and give me your thoughts.

I hope this is what you were looking for and that I'm at least in the ballpark!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Program Information Specialist (Outreach)
U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office (OBP PMO)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

For more information about the OBP PMO, visit http://cbp.gov/xp/cgov/border_security/ti/.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 6:24 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: URGENT - O-1 through O-3 messaging

All - In light of the progress we've made with IBWC and a rather unflattering article published in RGV, we need to put our heads together on what our public messaging is going to be with respect to our current status and next steps. Since (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and I are both on the road, we put our heads together on a time and it looks like 8AM est will work best for us. Are you all available?

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: OIG Steel Review
Date: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 7:52:16 AM
Attachments: (b) (5)

It's in the invite. But I've attached it here too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Deputy Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 7:44 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: OIG Steel Review

Can you send me the original report? I don't recall receiving it. Thanks

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 7:35 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: OIG Steel Review

I've included your comments in the matrix for discussion today. Thanks!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Deputy Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 12:31 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: OIG Steel Review

Please see my comments below:

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 8:01 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: OIG Steel Review

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Can you please provide any history that you have on this? Much appreciated.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Program Manager,
Real Estate and Environmental Services Division,
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office

1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Suite B-155
Washington, DC 202

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 7:50 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: OIG Steel Review

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) might be able to help here too since he'll remember the history of the O-1 through O-3 issue (and he's still living it).

Please let me know what is correct and what should be re-written. For those sections that need to be re-written, please provide suggested language.

"In 2007, CBP performed an environmental assessment and determined that a permanent fence would result in adverse affects to the flood plain and recommended moveable fence. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) First, we prepared a hydraulic analysis of the original proposed fence alignments using IBWC's HEC RAS model, not an "environmental assessment". A draft EIS was prepared for the segments but its focus was on the natural, biological, cultural and socioeconomic impacts of the proposed fence (not hydraulic impacts). Second, the removable fence was considered (never recommended) as an option to expedite IBWC's approval of the fence installation since the required GFM type and quantity would essentially stay the same as permanent fencing but the requirement to model the potential floodplain impacts would become moot. A logistics analysis of using removable fence instead of permanent fence was prepared by CBP and concluded it was not feasible as the time required to remove the fence in a pending flood event was too great. Despite this recommendation, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (never a "recommendation"), the steel that CBP purchased was of a type to build permanent fence, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (the same GFM would have been used had the temporary fence been determined to be feasible). CBP purchased approximately 11,300 tons, or \$20.5 million, of steel to build 14 miles of permanent fence along the Rio Grande Valley. However, CBP did not meet the International Boundary Water Commission's (IBWC) criteria for a fence type that would minimize effects of water flow on the flood plain. CBP consulted with the IBWC between 2008 and 2010 to find a solution to the impact on the flood plain. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) The consultation with IBWC continues. Based on IBWC's recommendation, we have now developed a new more robust 2-dimensional (FLO-2D) hydraulic model (versus IBWC's original 1-dimensional HEC RAS model) that more accurately reflects the impacts of the proposed permanent fence alignment on the floodplain. The results from the analysis indicate that the fence does meet IBWC's thresholds. We are currently finalizing the Report, which IBWC then plans to share Mexico to seek their concurrence. The IBWC ultimately denied support of CBP's proposal of permanent fence in this area because of the potential adverse impacts to the flood plain. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Not accurate According to CBP, it did not construct a movable fence in this area because of high cost." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Not accurate. The primary reason was it would take too long to remove the fence to have it out of the floodplain prior a flood event (e.g. IBWC told us they could provide us as much as 72 hrs notice of a pending flood event; we determined we

could not logistically remove the fence within 72 hrs)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Deputy Director, Business Operations Di

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office

Facilities Management and Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 2:23 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: URGENT - O-1 through O-3 messaging

All:

Attached -- per our conversation this morning -- is an initial draft of the talking points surrounding the O-1 through O-3 projects. This would set the basis for a more developed media strategy.

Please review and give me your thoughts.

I hope this is what you were looking for and that I'm at least in the ballpark!

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Program Information Specialist (Outreach)
U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP)
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office (OBP PMO)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

For more information about the OBP PMO, visit http://cbp.gov/xp/cgov/border_security/ti/.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 6:24 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: URGENT - O-1 through O-3 messaging

All - In light of the progress we've made with IBWC and a rather unflattering article published in RGV, we need to put our heads together on what our public messaging is going to be with respect to our current status and next steps. Since (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and I are both on the road, we put our heads together on a time and it looks like 8AM est will work best for us. Are you all available?